



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Ehrlich's treatment of his subject is independent and suggestive throughout. Even where his conclusions fail to be accepted, his novel grouping of the evidence will lead to numerous advances in our knowledge.

Misprints are very few. The only one of any consequence that has been observed is in l. 3 of p. 28, where one should read $\pm - | \pm$ for $\pm | \pm$.

E. H. STURTEVANT

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

I Fasti Consolari Romani. By GIOVANNI COSTA. Milan: Libreria Editrice Milanese, 1910. Vol. I, Parts 1 and 2. Pp. x+547; 150.

L'Originale dei Fasti Consolari. By GIOVANNI COSTA. Rome: E. Loescher & Co., 1910. Pp. 77.

These books are a monument of zeal and patience if not of wisdom. In the preface of the first the author states that he proposes to initiate a "radical and fundamental" reform in the study of Roman history by substituting a consistent inductive method for what he regards as the more or less haphazard method of criticism hitherto in vogue. With this laudable purpose in mind he devotes this volume to an exhaustive study of the lists of magistrates of the republic, intending in the second volume to restore the original, which he calls the *spina dorsale* of Roman history, and to draw such conclusions as may be based upon it. It is perhaps unfair to pass final criticism before the constructive part of the work is in our hands, but it is at least proper to express grave doubt as to the surpassing value of this *spina dorsale*. It is not of great importance, for our real appreciation and understanding of the development of the history of Rome, that we should know whether a Fabius or a Claudius was consul in any particular year. So our eagerness to know what revolutionary use Costa will make of such facts when determined is all the more keen.

His theory is in brief this: In literature and on the monuments we have two distinct traditions of the list of magistrates of the first three centuries of the republic, both derived from the records of the pontiffs, the *Annales pontificum*. One, which he calls the chronographic, was that of the revised form of the *Annals*, published by Q. Mucius Scaevola, and known as the *Annales maximi*. This was the basis of the chronicles of Nepos and Atticus and of Varro's work, and is preserved for us with varying degrees of accuracy in Diodorus, Cicero, Velleius, the *Fasti Consulares* and *Triumphales* on the Regia, Tacitus, Cassius Dio, Pliny, and the *Chronograph* of 354 A.D. The other tradition was based on the *Libri lintei* made up from the *Annales pontificum* in the latter part of the fourth century B.C. This was a simple list, and preserved for the earlier period a greater degree of authenticity than the more elaborate *Annales* themselves, which suffered at the hands of editors

from Cn. Flavius to Scaevola. This was the version employed by the earlier annalists—Fabius, Cato, Piso, Tubero, Licinius—and found in Livy, Dionysius, Appian, Valerius Maximus and Plutarch. Valerius Antias distorted it to suit his own purposes, and the combination of his version and the more genuine one of Livy is seen in the *Epitome* of the latter. Besides these two traditions we must, for the later period, take a certain amount of contemporary evidence into account, but it is with the period before the Second Punic War that the investigation is mainly concerned.

The task that the author has set before himself is to establish from the extant material the existence of these two traditions, to differentiate them satisfactorily, to show that each historian or writer is following one or the other, and to explain apparent discrepancies and contradictions. Furthermore, as the tradition seems in some cases to have been contaminated, it is necessary to show how this condition has come about. For instance, Plutarch represents the annalistic tradition, but certain statements of his can be traced to the chronographic tradition as given by Cicero, Varro, and the source of Velleius which was here akin to Fenestella as represented by Asconius—all three of which influenced Plutarch at different times!

To the accomplishment of this task—the magnitude of which is only equaled by the naïve assurance of the author that he has been successful—Costa brings ripe scholarship, an astonishing command of the material, and a still more astonishing degree of ingenuity in the combination of data. In the opinion of the reviewer, however, his elaborate argument fails to carry conviction. It is developed by successive inferences from quite uncertain hypotheses, which in the author's mind have gradually established themselves as facts. There is no weight of cumulative evidence, and each step in the process is less certain than the preceding. The method is the same for each source discussed, and the same criticism holds for each, but to illustrate the process in any adequate way would require too much space.

Failure to prove his main thesis, however, does not by any means render all of Costa's work idle, and much valuable information may be gathered from the painstaking analysis to which each of the sources in question has been subjected, although this is carried too far and often becomes fanciful. In the second part of the volume the author presents in tabular form, with annotations, lists of magistrates made up from Cicero, Diodorus, Asconius, Cassius Dio, Pliny, Polybius, the *Epitome* of Livy, and the sources of Eutropius and Orosius. This material is arranged in convenient form and will be found very useful for reference.

The second of the two books under consideration illustrates again the imagination and ingenuity of the author. From his study of the lists of military tribunes with consular power for the thirty-four years in which these lists are given in our sources with variations in number and order, he comes to the conclusion that these variations are to be explained primarily by the boustrophedonic method of writing employed in the original. Furthermore, the

lists of successive years were not written on separate lines but followed each other without spacing, and therefore might be read in different ways. For instance, for the year 350 AUC we find in the *Fasti Capitolini* and Diodorus the names arranged in this order: P. Cornelius, Cn. Cornelius, Fabius, Nautius, Valerius, Sergius; while in Livy the last two precede the others. This Costa regards as evidence that the original read thus—

- | | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|------------|-------------|
| 1. P. Cornelius | 2. Cn. Cornelius | 3. Fabius | 4. Nautius |
| | | 6. Sergius | 5. Valerius |

and that this original reading was copied in different ways. This is a simple case compared with some, but each apparent exception furnishes another opportunity for an ingenious combination.

This boustrophedonic method, therefore, having been proved for the lists of military tribunes, must be applied to the entire *fasti* of the earlier period, and, in the author's opinion, it is this that was the ultimate cause of variation between the two subsequent traditions, the chronographic and annalistic. In an appendix we have a table which represents Costa's idea of the appearance of the original *fasti* from 330 to 387 AUC. Much that he says is plausible, but the theory is pushed too far, and the superstructure topples of its own weight.

S. B. P.

A Study of Augustine's Versions of Genesis. By JOHN S. McINTOSH.

Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1912. Pp. x+130.

75 cents net.

This dissertation, after a few introductory pages which review various theories of the origin and nature of the Old Latin Bible, selects for especial attention the Book of Genesis as it is known from quotations in the works of Augustine. The study falls into three main divisions: (1) a reconstruction of the text; (2) an analysis of the varying forms of the quotations found in different places in Augustine's writings; and (3) a consideration of the Latinity of the Old Latin Genesis.

In the first part Dr. McIntosh follows wherever available the modern editions of Dombart, Knöll, and the editors of the Vienna *Corpus*; elsewhere, ignoring the work of the Benedictines of St. Maur, he follows the text of its reprint by Migne. The quotations collected are printed continuously on pp. 13-43, but the list of passages from which they are taken is inconveniently deferred to pp. 125-30. Tested by a random examination of the *indices locorum* of several volumes of the Vienna *Corpus* and a hasty search through a few hundred pages in various volumes of Migne's edition, the collection of quotations appears fairly exhaustive. There should be added to it, however, Gen. 6:22 (found in *Retract.* 2, 80, and apparently noted by McIntosh himself later, on p. 49), and Gen. 10:1 (found, in part, in *De civ.* 16, 3). In Gen. 17:3 the proper reading is *suam* not *tuam*.